

REMARKS

I. Status of Application

Claim 44 is currently pending in the present application. Claims 23-26, 28, 30, 33, 35, 37 and 44 currently stand rejected.

II. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority and for indicating receipt of the certified copy of the Priority Document.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 23-26, 28, 30, 33, 35, 37 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Minari (6,809,831). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for *at least* the independent reasons stated below.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that claims 23-26, 28, 30, 33, 35 and 37 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and, therefore, the Examiner's rejections with respect to claims 23-26, 28, 30, 33, 35 and 37 are now moot.

Further, according to the MPEP, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (MPEP § 2131). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 44 positively recites limitations which are not disclosed (or suggested) by Minari.

For example, without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, claim 44 has been amended, as set forth above, to recite (among other things):

...transmitting print setup information and an
electronic mail address for a user of the print

system, from the distributor terminal to the
print control server...

wherein the image data is provided by a
user of the distributor terminal and is stored at
the print control sever; and

wherein the user of the print system
can browse the browsing HTML file...

Minari fails to disclose or suggest the above features. The grounds of rejection allege that the print processing system disclosed in Minari corresponds to a print system, as claimed. The grounds of rejection also allege that Minari's host computer corresponds to a distributor terminal, as further recited in claim 44. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds of rejection.

Claim 44 plainly requires an electronic mail address for a user of the print system, as well as, wherein the image data is provided by a user of the distributor terminal. That is, claim 44 recites both a user of the print system and a user of the distributor terminal. Minari nowhere discloses or suggests a user of a print system and a user of the distributor terminal, as claimed. In fact, Minari discloses just the opposite of claim 44—that the user of Minari's print processing system and Minari's host computer are one in the same. Therefore, Minari does not teach, and cannot possibly suggest, the claimed electronic mail address for a user of the print system and the claimed browsing HTML file which the user of the print system can browse.

Accordingly, claim 44 is not anticipated by Minari for *at least* these reasons and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Andrew J. Taska /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 1, 2008

Andrew J. Taska
Registration No. 54,666